



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/730,710	12/06/2000	Alan Edward Kaplan	Kaplan 2000-0066	7991

7590 07/14/2004

Henry T. Brendzel
P.O. Box 574
Springfield, NJ 07081

EXAMINER

ELAHEE, MD'S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/730,710

Applicant(s)

KAPLAN ET AL.

Examiner

Md S Elahee

Art Unit

2645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 25-32 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 25-32 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 04/23/04. Claims 1-23, 25-32 and 35 are pending. Claims 24, 33, 34 and 36 have been deleted.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23, 25-32 and 35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 1, the limitations 'a plurality of POTS CPE ports adapted.....to a POTS CPE' and 'a switch interposed between said first port and said POTS CPE ports' in lines 5, 6 respectively, lead confusion. It is, because a switch (e.g., 204 on fig.1) is only interposed between two ports (port for connecting to device 10 and port for connecting to line 100, fig.1).

Regarding claim 27, the limitations 'a non-multiplexed baseband signal' in lines 5, 6 is not disclosed in the original specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1, 9, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it is not clear what "POTS signaling format" is. It seems that POTS has multi signaling format such as non-caller ID signaling format VS Caller ID signaling format. Further, the claimed invention uses non-traditional signaling format (i.e., called party ID) which is also not belonged to the POTS signaling format.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase 'said POTS CPE port' on page 2, lines 12 and 13 of the claim respectively, lacks sufficient antecedent basis because it appears that the phrase 'said POTS CPE port' should be 'said POTS CPE ports'.

Regarding claim 9, the phrase 'said second module' on page 3, line 2 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 13, the phrases 'said first port' and 'said first module' on page 4, lines 8 and 9 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

Regarding claim 17, the phrase 'said special service message' on page 4, line 2 of the claim lacks sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2645

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 13-19, 22, 23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,569).

Regarding claim 1, Peters teaches a telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port) adapted for connecting (i.e., interfacing) with a telecommunication network via ringing signaling format (i.e., plain-old-telephone-service (POTS) signaling format) (fig.1; col.3, lines 50-63).

Peters further teaches a plurality of subscriber line connection ports (i.e., POT CPE ports) adapted for connection to a subscriber line device (i.e., POT CPE) (fig.1; col.1, lines 16-22, col.3, lines 50-63).

Peters further teaches a selector switch (i.e., switch) interposed between the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port) and the subscriber line connection ports J2 (i.e., POT CPE ports) (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

Peters further teaches a ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., control module), responsive to one or more ringing signal cadences (i.e., special service messages) originating at a central office and received via the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port), for affecting the switch based on information contained in the one or more ringing signal cadences, where the ringing signal cadences belong to a finite set that includes cadence (i.e., called party ID message), and ringing signal (i.e., alert signal), those being distinct elements of the set, and excludes caller ID message (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50). (Note: each of the cadences is

in association with respectively different subscriber number, which refers to a called party ID message)

Peters further teaches an off-hook detector circuit (i.e., signaling detection module) responsive an off-hook condition at the subscriber line connection port J2 (i.e., POT CPE port) for applying an off-hook detection signal to the ringing signal cadence detection circuit (abstract; col.3, lines 1-13, col.8, lines 10-44, col.9, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 2, Peters teaches that the ringing signal cadence detection circuit causes delivery of a cadence (i.e., message) to the second connection (i.e., POT CPE port), the cadence is taken from a set that includes a ringing signal (i.e., alert message) (col.2, lines 38-67, col.3, lines 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 3, Peters teaches that one or more ringing signal cadences (i.e., special service messages) are embedded in an alert signal (col.3, lines 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 4, Peters teaches that the ringing signal contains ringing signal bursts within a ringing cycle (fig.3-5; col.3, line 68-col.4, line 15).

Regarding claim 7, Peters teaches that the off-hook detector circuit (i.e., signaling detection module) operates to cause the processor to establish a connection between the telephone line connection port and the subscriber line device connection port when the off-hook detector circuit (i.e., signaling detection module) determines an off-hook condition at the second connection (i.e., POT CPE port) (col.3, lines 1-13, col.8, lines 10-44, col.9, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 8, Peters teaches that the ringing signal cadences (i.e., special service messages) comprises a coded ringing signal (fig.3-5; col.3, line 68-col.4, line 15).

Regarding claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Peters teaches a ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., control module), coupled to the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., POTS network port) for decoding cadence (i.e., called number information) embedded in the ringing (i.e., alerting) signal (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50). (Note: ringing signal cadence detection circuit is responsive to a respectively different ringing cadence and produces output only when the ringing signal cadence to which it is responsive is detected, therefore, it is clear that the ringing signal cadence detection circuit is decoding the ringing signal cadence in order to produce output)

Peters further teaches a control circuit (i.e., second module), responsive to the ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., first module), for controlling state of the selector switch (i.e., switch) (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, col.5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claims 14, Peters teaches that the cadence (i.e., called number information) is embedded in an alerting signal in the form of ringing signal burst within a ringing signal (fig.3-5; col.3, line 50-col.4, line 15, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 15, Peters teaches a LED indicator (i.e., display) responsive to the ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., control module) (fig.1; col.8, line 56-col.9, line 2).

Regarding claims 16 and 28, Peters teaches an off hook detector connected to the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port), for applying an off-hook detection

Art Unit: 2645

signal to the ringing signal cadence detection circuit (abstract; col.3, lines 1-13, col.8, lines 10-44, col.9, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 17, Peters teaches that the ringing signal cadence detection circuit detects cadence (i.e., called number information) in the ringing signal cadence (i.e., special service message) (col.3, line 50-col.4, line 15, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 18, Peters teaches that the ringing signal cadence (i.e., special service message) is in the form of digital information preceding, or following a first ringing signal burst (col.3, line 50-col.4, line 15, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 19, Peters teaches that the ringing signal cadence detection circuit matches (i.e., compares) information decoded from the ringing signal cadence (i.e., special service message) to one or more pre-stored numbers within the ringing signal cadence (col.2, lines 38-68, col.6, lines 54-65).

Regarding claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 13. Furthermore, Peters teaches a ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., first module) coupled to the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port) for receiving from the telephone line connection port J1 an incoming ringing signals (i.e., non-multiplexed baseband signal) which, inter alia, is adapted to carry an alert signal and the special service messages (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

Peters further teaches a plurality of selector switches (i.e., switches), separate from each other, with each switch is interposed between the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port) and subscriber line connection ports (i.e., one of the POT CPE ports) (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 29, Peters teaches at least one of the switch matrices is a normally closed switch (fig.1, 2; col.5, lines 39-50).

Regarding claim 30, Peters teaches at least one of switch matrices is inherently a normally open switch (fig.1, 2; col.5, lines 39-50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5, 11, 12 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,569) and in view of Ardon (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,419).

Regarding claim 5, Peters fails to teach "said second module includes an associated memory, and control said state of said switch based on information stored in said memory and information contained in said special service message". Ardon teaches that the processor (i.e., second module) includes an associated memory, and affects (i.e., controls) the switch matrix (i.e., state of the switch) based on information stored in the memory and information contained in the one or more FSK signals (i.e., special service messages) (fig.7; col.9, lines 1-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow the second module including an associated memory, and control the state of the switch based on information stored in the memory and information contained in the special service

Art Unit: 2645

message as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the storage for the information so that the stored information would be used to make comparison with the information contained in the incoming signal.

Regarding claim 9, It is not clear whether Peters teaches a ringing signal generator responsive to the second module, for applying a ringing signal to one or more of the POTS CPE ports. Ardon teaches a signaling unit (i.e., ringing signal generator) responsive to the processor (i.e., second module), for applying an alerting signal (i.e., ringing signal) to the second connection (fig.7; col.9, lines 1-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow a ringing signal generator responsive to the second module, for applying a ringing signal to the POT CPE port as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide ringing signal to the called party.

Regarding claim 10, Peters teaches that the alerting signal (i.e., ringing signal) is inherently a coded ringing signal.

Regarding claim 20, Peters fails to teach "said first module detects a special service message that includes a number to be stored, and causes said second module to store said number so as to include said stored number among said one or more pre-stored numbers". Ardon teaches that the processor detects an FSK signal (i.e., special service message) that includes a number to be stored, and causes the signaling unit (i.e., second module) to inherently store the number so as to include the stored number among the one or more pre-stored numbers (abstract; fig.5; col.8, lines 1-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow the first module detecting a special service message that includes a

Art Unit: 2645

number to be stored, and causes the second module to store the number so as to include the stored number among the one or more pre-stored numbers as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to store the number for future use.

Regarding claim 21, Peters further teaches the number arrives at the control circuit (i.e., second module) in the same signaling format that all other special service messages have (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, col.5, lines 39-50). However, it not clear whether Peters teaches the number to be stored arrives at the second module. Ardon teaches that the number to be stored arrives at the signaling unit (i.e., second module) (abstract; fig.5; col.8, lines 1-21). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow the number to be stored arrives at the second module as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the number to be stored for future use.

Regarding claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 21. Furthermore, Peters teaches an off-hook detector circuit (i.e., second signaling detector), responsive to signals from the subscriber line connection port J2 (i.e., POT CPE port), for receiving a number in the second module (abstract; col.3, lines 1-13, col.8, lines 10-44, col.9, lines 41-53).

Regarding claim 23, Peters teaches an off-hook detector circuit (i.e., second signaling detector), is responsive to DTMF or pulse signaling from the telephone terminal (col.3, lines 1-13, col.8, lines 10-44, col.9, lines 41-53).

11. Claims 6, 11, 12, 25, 26 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,569) and in view of Ardon (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,419) and further in view of Swan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,320).

Regarding claim 6, Peters in view of Ardon fails to teach a time-of-day clock coupled to the second module, to assist the control module to affect the switch. Swan teaches a TOD clock (i.e., time-of-day clock) coupled to the processor, to assist the processor to affect the on-hook/off-hook switch (col.6, lines 15-21, col.7, lines 8-11; 'processor' reads on the claim 'second module' and 'on-hook/off-hook switch' reads on the claim 'switch'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters in view of Ardon to allow a time-of-day clock coupled to the second module, to assist the control module to affect the switch as taught by Swan. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the time and date information.

Regarding claims 11 and 25, Peters fails to teach "whether said special service messages indicate that a connection with said apparatus is sought to be established to a called number that is listed in a directory that is accessible to everyone". Ardon teaches that the FSK signals (i.e., special service messages) indicate that a connection with the apparatus is sought to be established to a terminating calling line identification (TCLID) (i.e., called number) that is listed in a directory that is accessible to everyone (fig.4, fig.6, fig.7; col.3, lines 7-33, col.9, lines 1-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow whether the special service messages indicate that a connection with the apparatus is sought to be established to a called number that is listed in a directory that is accessible to

Art Unit: 2645

everyone as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide listed number in the directory so that it will be easier to compare the number from the incoming signal with the listed number.

Peters further fails to teach “whether said special service messages indicate that a connection with said apparatus is sought to be established to a called number that is unlisted in said directory”. Ardon teaches that the FSK signals (i.e., special service messages) indicate that a connection with the apparatus is sought to be established to a terminating calling line identification (TCLID) (i.e., called number) that is unlisted in a directory that is accessible to everyone (fig.4, fig.6, fig.7; col.3, lines 7-33, col.9, lines 1-23). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to allow whether the special service messages indicate that a connection with said apparatus is sought to be established to a called number that is unlisted in the directory as taught by Ardon. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the unlisted number in the directory so that it will be easier to provide the regular ringing signal to the called party.

Peters in view of Ardon fails to teach “said special service messages indicate the calling number that seeks to establish a connection with said apparatus”. Swan teaches that the incoming calls indicate the calling number that seeks to establish a connection with the apparatus (col. 7, lines 8-11, col. 9, lines 10-18; ‘incoming calls’ reads on the claim ‘special service messages’). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters in view of Ardon to allow the special service messages indicating the calling number that seeks to establish a

Art Unit: 2645

connection with the apparatus as taught by Swan. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the calling party telephone number.

Peters in view of Ardon fails to teach that the ringing signal is coded to indicate time of day. Swan teaches that the ringing signal is selected to indicate Time Of Day (TOD) clock (col. 7, lines 8-11, col. 9, lines 19-35; 'ringing signal is selected' reads on claimed 'said ringing signal is coded'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters in view of Ardon to allow the ringing signal is coded to indicate time of day as taught by Swan. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the time and date information.

Regarding claims 12, 26 and 35, Peters in view of Ardon fails to teach "said type of call is taken from a set that includes collect call, cellular calls, international calls, fax calls, modem calls, and credit card calls". Swan teaches that the call is selected based on the incoming caller CLID information (col. 9, lines 19-35; 'call is selected' reads on claimed 'type of call is taken' and 'the incoming caller CLID information' reads on the claim 'collect call, cellular calls, international calls, fax calls, modem calls, and credit card calls'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters in view of Ardon to allow the type of call being taken from a set that includes collect call, cellular calls, international calls, fax calls, modem calls, and credit card calls as taught by Swan. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to provide the selection of the call based on the caller ID information.

12. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,569) and in view of Shalev (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,984).

Regarding claim 31, Peters teaches a ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., first module) coupled to the telephone line connection port J1 (i.e., first port) for decoding the ringing signal cadences (i.e., special service messages) embedded in the alerting signal, the telephone line connection port J1 having two terminals, and the ringing signal cadence detection circuit adapted to respond to POTS signals (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, 50-63, col.5, lines 39-50).

However, it is not clear whether Peters teaches a series connection of a ringer and a ringer switch, across first port. Shalev teaches a series connection of a ring generator (i.e., ringer) and a ringer switch, across the tip and ring wires (fig.1b; col.6, lines 15-21; 'tip and ring wires' reads on the claim 'first port'). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to have a series connection of a ringer and a ringer switch, across the first port as taught by Shalev. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to feed the ringing voltage to all ringing subscriber lines for which all connected equipment is on-hook.

Peters further teaches a series connection of telephone circuitry and a selector switch (i.e., hook switch), across the two terminals (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.5, lines 39-50).

Peters further teaches a control circuit (i.e., processor), responsive to the ringing signal cadence detection circuit (i.e., first module), for controlling state of the selector switch (i.e., ring switch) (fig.1, 2; col.2, lines 45-61, col.3, lines 14-22, col.5, lines 39-50).

13. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,142,569) and in view of Koohgoli et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,968).

Regarding claim 32, Peters teaches identifying the cadence (i.e., called number ID) is embedded in the alerting signal (col.3, lines 14-22, 50-63, col.5, lines 35-39).

Peters further teaches matching (i.e., comparing) the cadence (i.e., called number ID) to cadence of the coupled circuit (i.e., at least one pre-stored number) (col.2, lines 38-68, col.6, lines 54-65).

It is not clear whether Peters teaches ascertaining whether at least one other call attribute is met from a set of attributes that includes caller ID, time of day, date, and type of call. Koohgoli teaches that ascertaining whether call-type signal is matched with the call-type information of the terminal equipment (i.e., at least one other call attribute is met from a set of attributes that includes caller ID, time of day, date, and type of call) (abstract; fig.2, 3; col.1, lines 33-60, col.4, lines 9-44). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters to ascertain whether at least one other call attribute is met from a set of attributes that includes caller ID, time of day, date, and type of call as taught by Koohgoli. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to feed the particular ringing signal to a terminal equipment of a particular call type.

Peters further teaches applying a ringing signal to the telephone when the at least one other call attribute is met and the cadence (i.e., called number ID) matches cadence of the coupled circuit (i.e., one of the at least one pre-stored numbers) (col.2, lines 38-68, col.5, lines 30-39, col.6, lines 54-65).

Art Unit: 2645

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S Elahee whose telephone number is (703) 305-4822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (703) 305-4895. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE
July 9, 2004

FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Fan Tsang', written in a cursive style.